

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

277 SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 500
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314

TELEPHONE: (703) 836-6400

FACSIMILE: (703) 836-2787

E-MAIL: COMMCENTER@OLIFF.COM
WWW.OLIFF.COM

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

April 2, 2003

To: Examiner T. Dougherty
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Group Art Unit 2834
Fax: (703) 305-1341

From: Scott M. Schulte

Your Ref.: 09/887,014

Our Ref.: 109851

Number of Pages Sent (Including cover sheet): 10

Prepared By: sxb

Comments:

Enclosed are the January 7 and March 11 filings as requested.

Sent by: _____

This facsimile is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this facsimile is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by facsimile or telephone, and return the facsimile to us by mail at the above address.

PTO RECEIPT FOR FILING OF PAPERS**► Hand Carry to Examiner T. Dougherty, Group Art Unit #2834****The following papers have been filed:**

Petition for Extension of Time, check no. 137899 (\$55); Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Name of Applicant: Isaai SHLIMAK et al.**Serial No.:** 09/887,014**Atty. File No.:** 109851**Title (New Cases):****Sender's Initials:** JAO:MMI/ccs

150/8

RECEIVED

JAN 7 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000

PATENT OFFICE DATE STAMP**COPY TO BE STAMPED BY PATENT OFFICE
AND RETURNED BY MESSENGER**

PATENT APPLICATION**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**Date January 7, 2003

In re the Application of

Isaai SHLIMAK et al.

Group Art Unit: 2834

Application No.: 09/887,014

Examiner: T. Dougherty

Filed: June 25, 2001

Docket No.: 109851

For: METHOD AND DEVICE FOR NON-CONTACT DETECTION OF EXTERNAL ELECTRIC
OR MAGNETIC FIELDS**SMALL ENTITY PETITION FOR 1st - 3rd EXTENSION
OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) AND
TRANSMITTAL OF FEE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.17**Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is a response to the outstanding Official Action in the above-identified patent application. The shortened statutory period having expired December 11, 2002, an extension of time for a period of one month is hereby requested. Attached hereto is our Check No. 137899 in the amount of \$55.00 in payment for:

 X Extension fee for response within first month pursuant to §1.136(a) (\$55.00)
 Extension fee for response within second month pursuant to §1.136(a) (\$205.00)
 Extension fee for response within third month pursuant to §1.136(a) (\$465.00)

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 15-0461. Two copies of this petition are enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--

PATENT APPLICATION

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 2834**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Isaai SHLIMAK et al.

Group Art Unit: 2834

Application No.: 09/887,014

Examiner: T. Dougherty

Filed: June 25, 2001

Docket No.: 109851

For: **METHOD AND DEVICE FOR NON-CONTACT DETECTION OF EXTERNAL
ELECTRIC OR MAGNETIC FIELDS**

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In reply to the September 11, 2002 Office Action, and the personal interview conducted on December 17, 2002, the period for reply extended by the attached one-month Petition for Extension of Time to January 11, 2003, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. Claims 1-31 and 33-40 are pending.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Dougherty during the December 17 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Applicants also appreciate the allowance of claims 21-31 and 38-40 in addition to the Examiner's indication that claims 7, 9 and 10 contain allowable subject matter. However, as discussed during the personal interview, Applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable.

Application No. 09/887,014

Claims 1, 3-5, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Maier et al. (hereinafter "Maier"), U.S. Patent No. 5,966,008; claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Maier in view of Ruigrok, U.S. Patent No. 6,278,588; claims 6, 8, 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or 103(a) over Maier; and claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Maier. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As agreed to during the personal interview, Maier fails to disclose a sensor for use in a device for non-contact detection of an external field by positioning the sensor at a spot where the external field is to be detected, the sensor comprising a delay line, which is to be exposed contactlessly to action of the external field and comprises a transducer arrangement that is provided on a substrate made of a material capable of transporting therethrough a wave sensitive to said external field, and defines a wave channel for the wave propagation through the substrate exposed to the external field so as to be directly affected by the external field, the transducer arrangement being capable of being actuated by an interrogation signal to generate the wave propagating through the wave channel and capable of converting the wave into an output response signal, said external field affecting a change in a velocity of the wave propagation through the substrate, said output response signal being thereby informative of said external field as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 11.

Similarly, Applicants submit that Maier fails to disclose a device for non-contact detection of an external field, comprising active and passive units, the passive unit comprising a substrate to be exposed to the external field so as to be directly affected by the external field, the substrate being made of a material capable of transporting therethrough a wave sensitive to said external field; and a delay line provided on said substrate to define a wave channel for the wave propagation through the substrate exposed to the external field, the delay line comprising a transducer arrangement capable of being actuated by said interrogation signal to generate said

Application No. 09/887,014

wave propagating through the wave channel and capable of converting the wave into said output response signal, said wave channel being exposed contactlessly to action of the external field, which effects a change in a velocity of the wave propagation, said output response signal produced by the passive unit being thereby informative of said external field as recited in claim 13.

As discussed during the personal interview, Maier discloses a current transformer which must comprise at least two elements, i.e., a surface wave configuration having surface wave structures and at least one antenna and at least one magnetosensitive element, which is to be exposed to the magnetic field of the current to be measured, being coupled to the surface wave structures (col. 2, lines 58-66). In particular, in Maier, the field to be measured directly influences the magnetosensitive element (12) and not the surface wave configuration. Instead, the magnetosensitive element then utilizes the wave structure to transmit a signal. Thus, in Maier, the wave structure is not directly affected by the field to be measured.

In addition, Ruigrok fails to overcome the deficiencies of Maier as discussed above with regard to claims 1 and 13, from which claims 2 and 14 depend. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Maier, either alone or in combination of Ruigrok, fails to disclose all the features of claims 1, 11 and 13, as well as all the features of claims 2-10 and 12, and 14-20 and 33-37, which depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Application No. 09/887,014

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 and 33-37 in addition to already allowed claims 21-31 and 38-40, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: January 7, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461